



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

country landscape, with the Poyser homestead. Behind the tragedy of the central story, enveloping it as it were, there is a broad tranquil sunny background of everyday human life, of rural calm. We must realize the enormous value of this background for the artistic effectiveness of the book. It emphasizes the temporary nature of the passing tragedy, it constitutes the norm to the central distortion of wrong and pain. George Eliot has made her story universally true and pathetic in that she has framed the agony of the few in the enclosing phlegmatic calm of nature. In such a book as Hardy's *Tess* the tension becomes over-great by the absence of adequate background; in a book like D'Annunzio's *Triumph of Death* the whole countryside is made to share the spasms of the protagonist. D'Annunzio is the less an artist, George Eliot is the more an artist, because the one disregards, the other aims at, one of the larger truths of life,—the ever-present tragic contrast of a serenely moving world-law with the fevers of humanity. This thought for the framing background, human and natural, is especially clear in the episode from *Adam Bede*. In fact, as I have said, the four episodes selected are very fair examples of the work of their authors; and if taken up in the order named they offer a steady increase in difficulty to the student, from the almost ostentatious crudity of Dickens' work to the microscopic attention to symbolic detail seen in Hawthorne. The interest taken by a class in interpreting this symbolism, in connecting Chapter 17 of the *Seven Gables* with the earlier chapter called "The Arched Window," for example, is extraordinary, and carries them over the difficulty which they invariably experience in adapting their visual range, after working in Thackeray and George Eliot, to the minuteness of the *Seven Gables*, where plot is transformed into protracted situation, and where details take the place of episodes.

ELEANOR P. HAMMOND.

University of Chicago.

### THE DEVELOPMENT OF TAINE CRITICISM SINCE 1893.

#### I.

AN attempt was made in 1899 by Wetz in *Zts. Spr. Litt.*, xxii, pp. 114-251, to give an estimate of later Taine-criticism. This article

is largely analytical, and does not attempt any résumé of the progress or development of Taine-criticism, to show how the opinion of critics in general, and of some individual critics in particular, has changed during the short time between his death in 1893, and the present day. The article does not include some of the more important works, confining itself to only eight critics. The present review proposes a discussion of the value of the important articles and works on Taine, and a statement of the progress criticism has made, in regard to the value, significance and importance of Taine's work.

The latest work on Taine, Giraud's *Essai sur Taine*, Hachette, 1901, by far the most complete and satisfactory treatise on the subject, gives an almost complete bibliography of his works in chronological order (published in *Rev. Hist. Litt. Fr.*, July, October, 1900), and of books and articles on Taine. The statistics of this bibliography show more than one hundred and seventy-five references before 1893, and over two hundred and twenty-five from 1893-1901. It is but natural that the criticisms before his death are mainly personal differences of opinion on the function and method of criticism, on the possibilities of the application of his system to both the natural and physical sciences. Many deal with his conception of the world, and among these some are extremely bitter and pessimistic, showing him to be a rank pessimist, destructive materialist, as Caro; absolute determinist and positivist, as Scherer; a firm sceptic, a Spinoza pantheist, as Planche. Such articles, however, emanate from the opposite school of philosophy or from close sectarians. Among all these criticisms there are very few that show an appreciation of the wider scope and significance of Taine's work. Mahrenholtz, Wetz, Pellissier, Sorel, Bourget, Brunetière, and a few of the English and American critics have given the broadest and most liberal estimates of his system and position in the history of literature; but the true meaning of Taine's work was not generally realized in France until after his death. The later critics, Deschamps, Monod, Barzellotti, Faguet, Giraud, and Wetz, are able to treat him from a more liberal and broader, yet at times individual point of view, showing more perspective, comprehension, and appreciation of his work as a whole, than

the earlier critics do. This has largely been made possible by the magnificent biographical essay of Monod, and all critics acknowledge their indebtedness to this work. Among these, Giraud is the first to apply Taine's own system to both himself and his work, and yet Giraud only partly succeeds in holding to this plan of study. This result is largely due to the fact that he introduces the individual religious conception of the universe. Many critics deplore the fact that Taine did not develop his system further, that the first notions of his early youth have remained the same; for the same system and doctrine are found in every work, whether it be a practical illustration of his system, as is his *English Literature*, or a theoretical treatise, as is his *Intelligence*. They failed to see that the only development lay in the accumulation of facts, and through these a broader interpretation of phenomena. This has been corroborated by science.

The present article will be confined to a discussion of Taine's later critics, rather from the standpoint of literary criticism than from that of pure philosophy. In 1893 alone over forty articles of various lengths are noted by Giraud; the more important, giving information on his life especially, are those of Vacherot, de Vogüé, Faguet, Larroumet, Barrès, Berthelot, Deschamps, Mahrenholtz, Boutmy, Barzellotti, Wetz, and Monod, and a series of estimates in the *Rev. Encycl.* 1 April, 1893, by Castets, Pellissier, Pillon, and Petit.

Boutmy, an intimate friend, has left one of the best general impressions we have and has come very near the truth when he states that Taine will not fully be understood and appreciated, that his importance and significance in the history of literary criticism will not be known for half a century; that many of his statements have been taken separately and have thus given a false impression; that his work should be analyzed as a whole. This was written in 1893 and still holds true to-day. Boutmy is the first to acknowledge and reveal that Taine was himself aware of the fact that his system could not be applied to all phenomena with impunity. According to him the danger lay merely in showing the natural complexity of phenomena too simply, and in the fact that the evolutions did not have their full

development. Taine has given us on all the confused masses of literature and history, etc., a point of departure, a mastery and possession, astonishingly profound perspectives and general views and these are really the end of all his speculations.

Hence his desire to transform all abstract notions to concrete ones, to accompany every idea by a sensation and clarify it by comparisons, by facts which he possessed *ad infinitum*.

The general objection to the *Anc. Reg.* (constant repetitions of disorders and crimes, thus becoming monotonous) is shared by Boutmy, Colani, Margerie, Barzellotti, but the reason assigned for this is to stir up the people's patriotism. The article ends with an admirable estimate of Taine, the man and his character.

In the first article in the *Rev. Encycl.* Castets reveals *Taine in time*, in which we gain quite a different view from that which is usual; there we find him receiving his friends at dinner every Monday: Berthelot, Boutmy, G. Paris, Renan, De Heredia, de Vogüé, but never accepting invitations. Pellissier calls Taine and Renan the great apostles of positivism; they have contributed more than any others to its triumph in all provinces of thought. The articles by Pillon and Petit on Taine, the philosopher and historian, are among the few really broad and appreciative estimates we have.

The first large book devoted entirely to Taine is written by Margerie—*H. Taine*, 1893. This work is variously estimated, according to the critic's attitude toward the Church. It is the result of thirty years of the study and teaching of Taine and his philosophy. His aim seems to be to show in what respect Taine is false and destructive of all morality; by what vices of method, by what unconscious prejudices, by what positivistic illusions he has been led to a philosophy which is the negation of philosophy from the speculative summit to its poetical application, from metaphysics to morality. According to Margerie his doctrine is so incoherent and inconsistent that it causes surprise to find such a vigorous and clear mind back of it, p. 68; no philosophy is less complete and less scientific, p. 75;

Taine contradicts himself continually and does not carry out his plan in his *Intelligence*, p. 158. The greater part of the four hundred and sixty-eight pages is an analysis of his works. At every point where Taine bears on the religious organizations and their development, methods and power, Margerie attacks him vigorously, because, according to him, all the defects in Taine's works are due to his strong determinism. Taine cannot speak authoritatively and feelingly on religious matters; he speaks as an outsider, as a man in whose eyes the interior principle, the central heart of religious life has no subjective value, none of truth, none of reality.

The religious interests concern him as a Christian, which he is not, being not even a theist; therefore, the most intimate in religious life escapes him, p. 471. Margerie, however, gives him credit for many fine qualities, a wonderful style: he paints as an analyst, and analyzes as a painter, p. 214.

An article unique in its kind, and possibly the most intimately sympathetic of all, was written by M. de Vogüé near the death-bed of Taine, and published in *Devant le Siècle*, 1896, pp. 289-297. We must know Taine personally, the man, the soul; however high his intelligence, it must be measured by his soul; a life without a stain, hidden too much from life to be known by the crowd. In the eyes of this old man, who had read all and knew all through books, one saw the divine look of a child. No one ever possessed more delicate sentiments for every human creature; more fear of saddening or wounding an honest faith; incapable of the slightest falsehood; he was the living conscience of his friends, who, when about to undertake something new, always asked: What will Taine think of it?

"I have just knelt before the bed of a Saint. If the abnegation of terrestrial things, if the abandonment of a life to eternal truths and to practicing good, merits this name, then no one has merited it more than this Benedictine, astray in our age. In him France lost the head of the literary and thinking world; this was recognized by all Europe."

In a short article in the *Zis. Spr. Litt.*, xv, 141-45, 1893, Mahrenholtz shows a deep appreciation of Taine, especially the historian. He was more of a philosopher and naturalist than an accurate, painstaking scholar, and he must

be judged according to his works and to what he has done; the petty and unimportant must be overlooked. Mahrenholtz claims, and probably rightly, that it must remain the task of the Germans to judge him impartially, and interpret him in the broad light necessary for a full appreciation. This task is yet before them.

The next important work is by Monod: *Renan, Taine, Michelet*, pp. 51-173. All critics acknowledge their indebtedness to this essay for an intimate acquaintance with his life, the relation and connection between his work and his life, and the development of both. It will remain standard until all of his correspondence and posthumous works are published; even then it will continue to be consulted by every Taine student.

The principal points that are new, or at least that were not generally known or appreciated enough, and are brought into prominence by Monod, are his firm convictions and honesty, his fearlessness and courage, his incapability of any personal attack, his opinion that any official system of philosophy or religion was a hindrance to liberty of thought; how Taine was condemned for wanting to apply scientific classification, methods and formulas to literary criticism and history, or for applying scientific methods to the moral sciences; that from the very beginning he refused to reply to any of his critics, because he believed that disputes that transfer questions of doctrines to personal quarrels only obscure the questions, p. 106; the influence of his system upon the young generation of rising writers, p. 108; the various letters Taine wrote to his friends, while yet a young man, explaining his ambitions and the pretensions of his doctrines; especially his letter to M. Havet, pp. 115-117; the influence of his married life and the change it brought about in his attitude toward the world, p. 199 sqq.; the effect of the war of 1870; the work he had planned. According to Monod the *Intelligence* forms the center of his work, all others are mere illustrations. From 1848-1850 he created his method and system; 1853-1858 he gathered particular cases and verifications of his system, *La Fontaine, Livy, Essays*; 1858-1868 he applied them to large literary and artistic generalization; 1870-1893

he applied them to a vast historical generalization. The study of Taine must depart from this classification, and Monod is the first to outline this plan. He is also the first to describe the state of French thought during this time, pp. 135-141, and to show Taine as the product of race, environment and time. Monod, as many later critics, has analyzed Taine and found his salient quality to be powerful logic, in which lies his weakness and grandeur, the secret of his power and of his defects, a wonderful mathematical mind, with a remarkable gift of visual imagination.

This combined faculty, according to Monod, explains the whole phenomenon of a Taine-system, imagination, style, p. 157. He is the first to insist upon the fact that in the study of Taine his method cannot be separated from his theories, and to explain why this cannot be done by giving an accurate account of his life and character which form part of his work. Monod is possibly the most impartial of Taine's critics, never hesitating to unveil his defects; for example, he simplified complex phenomena too much; exaggeration and incompleteness. This essay has made it possible for later critics to write or develop a complete study of Taine, the man and his work.

Pellissier, in his *Nouv. Ess. sur la Litt. Contemp.*, 1894, has a most suggestive article on Taine, analyzing his method, system and their result. According to him he must be studied under three heads: as a literary critic, as a historian, as a philosopher, and the necessary relation among them. The difference between his system and that of Sainte-Beuve is especially well brought out. Taine is the coordinator of knowledge; Sainte-Beuve studies the individual only; literary productions are mere documents and criticism an art; he is the initiator of the natural method of criticism, while Taine is the organizer.

According to Taine there is no difference of nature between the moral and natural or material world, human and natural history; both undergo the same organic laws; hence the same method is applied to the study of both.

Pellissier's article is one of the best to analyze Taine's method, or rather to interpret it, giving a clear exposition of the laws of

dependencies, salient quality and primordial forces; the advantages and objections of the system, pointing out how often Taine either neglects the traits that cannot be applied to his formula, or forces minor traits too much in order to explain and prove his formula, thus being often very unreliable; constantly pre-occupied with philosophy and the finding of laws, Taine overlooked the importance of individuality. As a whole, his system is no longer used; it remains what it was with Sainte-Beuve. His place is fixed in modern criticism by the force of his reasoning and the beautiful symmetry of his constructions, and yet his influence is still great. He has stated precisely and put in order and grouped the ideas that had been floating about for years, more or less vague, in the contemporaneous atmosphere; he has so put his stamp on them, grouped them with such vigor, that we really look upon them as his own; so that, were we to seek a name that would embody the truest character of the intellectual movement of the last fifty years, we must name Taine.

In February, 1895, Taine's successor to the French Academy was installed, and in his *Discours* (published in *Nouv. Ess. d'Hist. et de Crit.*, pp. 119-144) M. Sorel has given an admiral portrait of Taine the man, and a splendid critical penetration of his work. To study the soul in itself, in the man of genius, in the history of human society, to see man as he is, neither monstrous nor abortive; to put him in his place in nature; to show that all in him and about him leads to a union of laws, and that the ideal towards which all aspirations tend is also the end of all the forces of nature and the universe, this is Taine's aim and purpose.

The report of this installation is made by M. G. Paris, in the *Débats*, February 8, 1895, (published in *Podtes et Penseurs*, pp. 340-348). Taine he considers as one of the five or six men that have represented intellectual France before the world; the most serious, the moral nobility, the sentiment of the beautiful, the power of work and love of truth. His glory shines brighter than ever. If, according to Taine, man is a "théorème qui marche," his life and works are certainly a "théorème qui évolue." This is growing evident more and

more, the more he is studied the more his grand life penetrates us by its example of honor, uprightness and industry; it expands as his works.

Barzellotti's book, *La Philosophie de Taine*, 1895, 1900, pp. 440, is from a philosophical point of view the most profound and penetrating work published; those parts treating of his literary qualities and his system as a whole have been treated with more literary penetration and knowledge by others; the work is really of much more importance to the student of philosophy than to the student of literature, although it does treat at length of Taine as a writer, and of his influence.

The first aim of the book is to examine the principles on which his doctrine is based, and the method that governs it, to show what there is elevated, durable, fruitful, defective, exclusive, contradictory and artificial; but the principal aim, and this is entirely new in Taine criticism, is to examine whether Taine can be defined, *au fond*, as a French intellect, fructified by ideas of Germanic origin and tradition. A secondary aim is to put Taine under the light of contemporaneous culture, proving that the motives and inspiring intentions of his genius and art respond to the intellectual exigencies of the time. Barzellotti, in a most admirable, clear manner shows the development of Taine's system, due especially to the intellectual need of research, demonstration and truth; the position he occupies towards philosophy, simply seeking a path to follow in the wake of ideas; his originality lies in his deep sympathy for all previous systems, his deep appreciation and exact interpretation of them; but, the author adds, his work somewhat surpassed this pretention.

His salient quality lies in a logical power of abstraction, of conceiving by means of general ideas and of deducting from these. His contact with the German spirit gave birth to and developed the most original part of his doctrine, the conception of the great law of the unity of things and their necessity; this he owes to Spinoza, Hegel and Goethe, pp. 31-35. It lies rather outside of the limits of this paper to state what Barzellotti has so clearly done, with regard to Taine's debt to Spinoza, Herder, Hegel and Goethe; in this field he has done more than any other critic. Taine's

originality lies in having created a species of comparative psychology of the primitive varieties of the organism and systems of human culture, which must be for their history what comparative anatomy of animals and plants is for zoölogy and botany, p. 101. It is interesting to note how opinion is gradually changing on the merit of Taine's *English Literature*. All later critics are coming to consider it as one of the most powerful and vigorous books of the latter half of this century. Barzellotti says the introduction is the most vigorous piece of historical philosophy written in France in our day; some of the pages of the work, for example, on Milton, Byron, etc., are enough to preserve the memory of any writer, p. 114.

Another new point he brings out is that Taine's works are lifelike and living, because of the ardent sympathy with which he has known how to find the most hidden vibrations in the hearts of eminent men; also, that Taine saw clearly that there was a limit to his own mind, but not to the human mind, which must be considered in the application of his method, and which accounts for the sympathy with which he knew how to transport himself into the products of the culture, thought and art of three peoples, for the continual research along the path in which the ideas and forms of literary invention can pass from one people and race to another, and take on a new impress; this brings him out as the greatest of modern French critics, p. 160.

An interesting study would be to examine the various judgments critics passed upon the nature of his studies of individuals, as Racine, etc. According to Barzellotti, in point of *finesse* and truth of historical and psychological examination, they have no equal; other critics denounce them utterly, refusing them any truth or life.

Taine's sociological-historical theory, studying in the work of art above all the sign of certain hereditary aptitudes and the necessary product of a certain moral temperament is not accepted by many historical scholars; Guyau is possibly the most prominent among those who uphold it; it may be stated, however, that many of the later scholars are leaning toward this theory. Hennequin opposes it; Barzellotti does not oppose it altogether.

To accuse him of having suppressed all

morality from history, by applying this theory, as Margerie does, is going too far. Few books breathe such a high moral sentiment and a more noble indignation against evil, p. 290.

According to Barzellotti all of Taine's comparative studies on the past of literature, art, and the social life of Europe can be looked upon as an introduction or preparatory study to his *Origines Contemporaines*, and this is a psychology of the mind and soul of his country, an anxious clinical diagnosis of his beloved patient, La France, p. 344. The work must be judged from the large aspect of art, as the last result of a literary elaboration to which a writer arrives in giving us his conception according to the plan he has traced and the aim he has proposed. Judged from this point of view, it impresses our author as a work which presupposes another or others to which it replies; it is the reply of an accuser to a defense already presented, of the partisan of the Revolution and Empire, p. 346. This attitude is entirely new. Barzellotti's conclusion is: As for the entire work, the grandeur of the enterprise seems to have surpassed the measure, if not of his talent, at least of his forces and his physical vigor; but the monumental and what is new will endure and those who cover this field by a different road will never lose sight of the profound traces which Taine has left, p. 350. This view is of great interest, coming from such a profound and trustworthy authority. From him the spirit of Taine's work is one of the vastest inquiries into facts and moral data on man and life ever undertaken in aid of historical investigation; no one before him has known better how to study souls, crowds, peoples, races, instead of soul, individual, race, p. 405.

In giving a general estimate of this work, it may be called the most comprehensive, profound, appreciative and satisfactory study on Taine that has appeared up to 1900. in some respects up to the present day.

The essay of Salomon in *Études et Portr. Litt.*, 1896, first appeared in the *Gaz. de France*, 1894; it hardly deserves a place among the more important works on Taine.

Wyzewa, *Nos Maitres*, 1895, makes the statement that Taine is hardly a scholar or philosopher, but a method, a prodigious *ensemble* of

formulas and operations, the most complicated, harmonious, perfect literary machine. This article, and those of Rod, Tissot, Colani, Lemaître, Renard and Biré, are all rather short, and more or less interesting reading, but they have added nothing new to the study of Taine.

HUGO P. THIEME.

*University of Michigan.*

### THE SOURCES OF ROMEO AND JULIET.

A comparison of Arthur Brooke's version of the story of Romeo and Juliet with that of Paynter shows that they are absolutely identical in plot. There is not an incident in one that is not in the other, nor in the order of incidents is there to be found any variation. One of two things must be true—and the first is mentioned only as a bare possibility, and to be at once dismissed as altogether unlikely: either Paynter made a metaphrase of Brooke's poem, or both followed pretty slavishly the same original. Boisteau's translation—or rather paraphrase—of Bandello's novel is not easily accessible. But if one postulates that paraphrase as the original of Brooke and Paynter, one may be absolutely certain what its plot is. There is no conflict in the testimony of two witnesses about it.

Boisteau took large liberties with his Italian original. Besides the important difference of not having Juliet wake before Romeo dies, there are several minor differences, one of which will serve by way of illustration. In Boisteau Romeo buys his poison of an apothecary whom he tempts by a handful of gold to break the law, for selling poison was a capital crime. Romeo is careful to put the name of this apothecary in the post-mortem letter he writes his father, and the poor fellow is promptly apprehended and tortured to death. It is difficult to see why Boisteau went out of his way to make the hero of his story do so unspeakably mean a thing as to tempt a man to wrong-doing by taking advantage of his poverty, and then report him to the authorities. The Bandello Romeo takes a vial of deadly poison and goes to Verona, but nothing is said about where he got it.

The Bandello story is so different from that